

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

| | | | |
|------------------|--|-------------------------|-----------|
| Applicant | Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District | Amount Requested | \$791,124 |
|------------------|--|-------------------------|-----------|

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---|----------------------------|-------------|
| Proposal Title | Lower Mission Creek Flood Control and Restoration Project – Reach 2B, Phase 1 | Total Proposal Cost | \$1,587,417 |
|-----------------------|---|----------------------------|-------------|

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

This Project is part of the overall 1.3-mile Lower Mission Creek Flood Control & Restoration Project. The Reach 2B Phase 1 portion of the overall project is part of a proposed bypass system intended to redirect high flows from the oxbow portion of Lower Mission Creek, a section that winds around and under State Highway 101, and that is notorious for sharp bends, low capacity and restricted flow. The proposed bypass will be constructed to redirect up to 2/3 of the design capacity flows of the overall project around the oxbow so that portion of creek between State Highway 101 and Chapala Street Bridge would remain untouched. This project will construct an extension of the existing box culvert which was constructed under the UPRR in 2009 upstream to the north side of Montecito Street at the U.S. Highway 101 right-of-way. This project is intended improve flood flow conveyance, reduce erosion and improve water quality.

PROPOSAL SCORE

| Criteria | Score/ Max. Possible | Criteria | Score/ Max. Possible |
|--|-------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Work Plan | 6/15 | Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits | 3/12 |
| Budget | 2/5 | Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits | 3/12 |
| Schedule | 3/5 | Program Preferences | 6/10 |
| Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures | 1/5 | | |
| Total Score (max. possible = 64) | | | 24 |

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The Work Plan criterion is marginally addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The identified tasks are commensurate with delivering the Project; however, there is not enough detail on how the Project will be implemented and achieve project goals. Similar to the Work Plans for Reaches 1A and 2A, subtask 9.2 Project Construction only discusses the duration of construction and labor compliance and does not discuss construction activities. The Work Plan stated that 95% Design is complete, but there are no specifications included with the application. There are also no monitoring tasks

identified in the Work Plan. There is no demonstration that the Project is a stand-alone project that can function without improvements to other reaches of Lower Mission Creek.

Budget

The Budget has some detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4, but not all the costs appear reasonable. Supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the items shown in the Budget categories described in Exhibit B. There is no explanation or documentation of how the project costs are estimated. The Budget categories do not agree with the tasks identified in the Work Plan or Schedule (i.e., different task names/headings were used in each attachment). No costs are included for Design and Engineering even though the Work Plan states the project is at a 95% design level; therefore, some costs would be expected to develop the 100% design package.

Schedule

The Schedule is not entirely reasonable and not consistent with the Work Plan and Budget. The tasks shown on the Schedule do not match those in the Work Plan or Budget. The level of detail provided in the Schedule is insufficient. For example, the Schedule should include a list of major Construction subtasks with their estimated timeline. The Schedule should include a timeline for submission of quarterly and final reports. The construction award is scheduled for July 3, 2012, 9 months after the anticipated grant award date (October 1, 2011).

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures criterion is minimally addressed and not documented. The application does not include the required Project Performance Measures Table. It is stated in the Work Plan that each reach of the overall Lower Mission Creek project will be constructed as a stand-alone project, but this section states that no monitoring, assessment or performance evaluation of Reach 2B, Phase I will be done until the entire bypass box culvert is constructed (Reach 2A and Reach 2B, Phase 2). It would seem that the flow that passes through the Reach 2B, as well as any decreases in erosion or sedimentation in the main stem of Lower Mission Creek could be monitored as part of this Project. In addition, no monitoring for special-status species (e.g., tidewater goby and steelhead) is mentioned in this application.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits

Low levels of FDR Benefits can be realized through this proposal, as demonstrated by the analysis and supporting documentation. An unreasonable process is used to determine project benefits. The Applicant assigns a percentage of the benefits available from the larger Lower Mission Creek project to this reach of the project without a clear rationale. The Applicant should calculate the expected annual damages that would occur from implementing the portion of the project Prop 1E funds are being requested for. The damages for the with- and without-project conditions are not supported by any inundation maps, depths of flooding, or quantification of the inundated structures. The analysis includes several other errors. For example, the Applicant uses a 6% escalation rate to inflate project costs, this is not acceptable. The Applicant also uses the wrong updating factors to determine project cost and event damage. It is possible that some FDR Benefits are available from this project, but it is not possible to determine their magnitude from the information submitted in the application. No Water Supply Benefits are claimed.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

Low levels of Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits can be realized through this proposal, as demonstrated by the analysis and supporting documentation. There is only a brief qualitative discussion of Water Quality or other Expected Benefits. No quantitative analysis is presented. Other expected benefits include environmental enhancement and aesthetic benefits.

Program Preferences

The Proposal includes a project that implements multiple Program Preferences including: Practice Integrated Flood Management, Protect Surface and Groundwater Quality, Expand Environmental Stewardship, and Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently. However, the Proposal demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.